

# Exhibit G

**Ari Ungar**

---

**From:** Siegfried, Jonathan <jonathan.siegfried@dlapiper.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 21, 2021 6:37 PM  
**To:** Ari Ungar  
**Subject:** RE: Bartlett v. SGBL

Ari,  
I am sorry we were unable to agree on this issue and that you feel it is necessary to involve the Court. We continue to believe that your request is premature and would lead to unnecessary and otherwise avoidable complications and disputes pending the Court's decision on defendants' motions to dismiss. We also do not agree with your characterization of our position or the Court's June 25 order. Hopefully, you will reconsider your position. I am happy to talk tomorrow if you would like.

Regards,  
Jon

Jonathan Siegfried  
Partner

---

T +1 212 335 4925  
F +1 212 884 8477  
M +1 646 431 7482  
jonathan.siegfried@us.dlapiper.com

DLA Piper LLP (US)  
dlapiper.com

---

**From:** Ari Ungar <aungar@osenlaw.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 19, 2021 3:19 PM  
**To:** Siegfried, Jonathan <Jonathan.Siegfried@us.dlapiper.com>  
**Subject:** Bartlett v. SGBL

**EXTERNAL MESSAGE**

Jon,

I write to follow up on our meet-and-confer this morning, having now had the opportunity to discuss our conversation internally.

I understood from our conversation that for various reasons Defendants are not amenable to proceeding with a Rule 26(f) Conference or generally proceeding with discovery before the Court issues a decision on Defendants' renewed motions to dismiss.

Plaintiffs' position is that because the Court's June 25, 2021 Order denied Defendants' application for a stay of discovery, discovery should not be further delayed. We therefore renew our request for

Defendants to engage in a Rule 26(f) Conference with Plaintiffs this week or next week. Plaintiffs are available on July 21, 22, 23, 28 and 30 for that conference. If Defendants wish to effectuate a de facto stay of discovery and are not prepared to engage in a Rule 26(f) Conference and to review and provide feedback on the draft protective order sent to defense counsel on July 2 until the Court rules on their Rule 12(b)(6) motions, please let us know by COB Wednesday and we'll raise the issue with the Court.

Regards,

Ari Ungar  
Attorney at Law

**OSEN LLC**  
2 University Plaza, Suite 402  
Hackensack, New Jersey 07601/ USA  
Telephone 201.265.6400  
Facsimile 201.265.0303  
[aungar@osenlaw.com](mailto:aungar@osenlaw.com)  
[www.osenlaw.com](http://www.osenlaw.com)

**CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:** The information contained in this electronic mail communication is intended only for the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. It may contain privileged and confidential information that is exempt from disclosure by law, and if you are not the intended recipient you may not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance upon it. If you have received this e-mail transmission in error, please notify our office immediately by e-mail or by telephone. Thank you for your cooperation. Osen LLC - Attorneys at Law.

The information contained in this email may be confidential and/or legally privileged. It has been sent for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). If the reader of this message is not an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any unauthorized review, use, disclosure, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication, or any of its contents, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please reply to the sender and destroy all copies of the message. To contact us directly, send to [postmaster@dlapiper.com](mailto:postmaster@dlapiper.com). Thank you.